IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

and
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 5358 of 2005

Between:

P. Gyanchander, S/o. P. Mallesham,
R/o. H.No.1-10-84, Flat No.304, Mount Santhoshi apartments, Begumpet, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1. The Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum-I, Hyderabad District A.P., Hyderabad.
2 K. Parvathulu, S/o. Late Kashanna,
R/o. H.No.1-2-593/45, Gagan Maha;1 Domalguda, Hyderabd.
3 Vishnu Chits Pvt Ltd., rep. by its Managing Director,
R/o. Regd. Office 312, 3rd Floor, Liberty Plaza, Basheerabadh, Hyd.
4 L. Veersh, Respondent No.3 Company,
R/o. B-26, Journalist Colony, road No.1, Jublee Hills, Hyderabd-34.
5 Smt. L. Manjulavani, W/o. L. Veersh,
R/o. B-26, Journalist Colony, Road No.1, JUbilee Hills, Hyd-34.
6 T.R. Venkatesh,
R/o. H.No.35, P&T Colony, Secunderabad.

..RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Certiorari; by calling for the records pertaining the orders dt. 21.2.2005 made in C.D.No.963 of the 2004 on the file of the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum-I Hyderabad district i.e., respondent No.1 herein and quash the same as arbitrary, illegal and against the provisions of the Consumers Protection Act, ii) granting all consequential benefits including costs.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.C.H.MURALI KRISHNA

Counsel for the Respondents : NP

The Court, at the stage of admission, made the following :

ORDER: (Per BRSR,J)

We are not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum-I, Hyderabad, made in C.D.No.963 of 2004, since

the petitioner has an alternative and effective remedy by way of appeal provided under the provisions of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, to the Commission. There is no reason as to why this Court should entertain this writ petition when the petitioner has an alternative and effective remedy. This writ petition is dismissed on the simple ground of there being an alternative and effective remedy available to the petitioner.

It is needless to observe that the appeal, if any, to be preferred by the petitioner herein shall be considered by the Commission on its own merits uninfluenced by the dismissal of this writ petition since we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

_____

B. SUDERSHAN REDDY, J.

Date: 17.03.2005

_____

C.V. RAMULU, J.

GS/BSC

To

1. The Presiding Officer, Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum-I, Hyderabad.

2. Two C.D. Copies.